

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LARRY JAMES BROOKSHIRE,

Plaintiff,

v.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF'S
DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:23-cv-2001 CSK P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a county jail inmate proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. On August 14, 2025, plaintiff filed a motion to compel production of documents. (ECF No. 42.) However, as the Court explained in its recent order, the deadline to file a motion to compel discovery expired on March 21, 2025.¹ (ECF No. 40 at 2 (citing ECF No. 23 at 5.)) Therefore, plaintiff's motion to compel discovery is untimely and is denied. Defendants are relieved of their obligation to respond to plaintiff's discovery motion (ECF No. 42).


Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

///

¹ Plaintiff claims he submitted additional discovery requests to defendants in June and July 2025, but such discovery requests were also untimely. As explained in the prior order, discovery requests must have been served on defendants on or before March 21, 2025. (ECF No. 40 at 2.)

- 1 1. Plaintiff's motion to compel production of documents (ECF No. 42) is denied as
- 2 untimely; and
- 3 2. Defendants are relieved of their obligation to respond to plaintiff's August 14, 2025
- 4 motion (ECF No. 42).

5 Dated: August 19, 2025

6 
7 CHI SOO KIM
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9 /1/broo2001.mtc3